

NIRD; RKVY Monitoring Unit, Delhi

Analytical Report on Punjab SAP

1. Name of the State

Punjab

2. What target the State decided to achieve using RKVY assistance during 11th Five Year Plan (FYP) for the agriculture sector as a whole and for the sub sectors?

The SAP mentions two budget outlays (including those under RKVY) for the 11th Five Year Plan period (2007-08 to 2011-12) as well as for the period 2009-10 to 2013-14, under RKVY for the agriculture & allied sectors. For the 11th Five Year Plan period, the total approved outlay of Rs 1165.76 crores includes a separate provision of Rs 485 crores under RKVY. In general, the SAP does not specify the targets in quantitative terms to be achieved during the 11th Five Year Plan, though it does indicate a target of raising the growth rate of *dairying* sub-sector from 4.14 per cent at present to 8 per cent.

However, the SAP touches upon the targets to be achieved under *State Agriculture Plan* (2009-10 to 2013-14), with proposed budget outlay of Rs 5370.8 crores for the five-year plan period ending 2014. Under the plan, the SAP targets annual growth rates of 3.0 per cent in the *crop* sector (including *horticulture*), 8 per cent in the *livestock/animal husbandry* sector, 10 per cent in the *fisheries* sector, and over 4 per cent in the overall *agriculture & allied* sector for the State. The SAP does give district-wise quantitative targets to be achieved during period 2009-10 to 2013-14. For example, increasing the production of wheat and paddy from 7.08 lac mt and 5.88 lac mt at present to 8.32 lac mt and 7.69 lac mt for the *Amritsar* district; to overcome a yield-gap of 63 kg lint/ha in cotton cultivation, experienced in 12,000 ha area of the *Barnala* district, thereby raising production output from 57,000 bales to 61,000 bales; and enhancing water use efficiency to save 60 to 70 per cent irrigation water by using *Micro/Drip* Irrigation in the *Faridkot* district, during the Plan period.

3. Which method (Method 1 or Method 2) is used for the preparation of SAP? How integration (methodology) of C-DAPs and prioritizing major interventions was done to prepare SAP?

There is no indication in the SAP about the method followed to prepare SAP.

The SAP mentions the use of respective district agricultural plans (DAPs) in its compilation. The SAP states that it utilizes the primary and secondary data provided in all the C-DAPs for identifying broad issues relating to major agricultural resource endowments, institutional infrastructure in agriculture and allied sectors representing major problems/shortcomings. The SAP further states about stratifying the State into five *Agro Climatic Zones* for sake of convenience, homogeneity and precision. The SAP gives the issues in detail at the zone-level. It also enumerates common issues pertaining to the State. The SAP also provides zone-wise/sector-wise proposed budget allocations for the SAP. However, a formal description on integration (methodology) of C-DAPs and prioritizing major interventions to prepare SAP is not stated in the SAP.

4. Whether SAP has critically analyzed and clearly stated the agricultural situation of the state vis-à-vis its districts through a SWOT analysis covering agro-climatic conditions, natural resources, infrastructure, institutions, technologies, manpower etc

A systematic SWOT analysis is not evident in the SAP. However, it is possible to discern the SWOTs in the SAP that analyzes and states the agricultural situation of the state vis-à-vis its districts covering agro-climatic conditions, natural resources, infrastructure, institutions, technologies, manpower etc. The main strengths include, rich agricultural area comprising alluvial plain with extensive irrigation by river systems and exploitation of underground water aquifers - *98 per cent area under irrigation*, high-levels of productivity for all major crops with 80 to 90 per cent of the yield potential achieved in most part of the State – *the State has been contributing surplus rice (50 per cent) and wheat (50-70 per cent) to the Central Pool for more than last two decades*, a high cropping intensity of 189 per cent, a high (98) per cent of the total cultivable area of the State under cultivation, high consumption of fertilizers (225 kg per ha vis-a-vis 128 kg per ha at national level), variety of climatic conditions and temperature in five agro-eco zones enabling production of different crops/fruits – *the State ranks first in production of Kinnow and Grape fruit*, potato seed produced in the State used in all major potato growing areas of the country, highest production of *Mushroom* among States – *contributes 40 to 50 per cent to the total national production of 60,000 to 70,000 tonnes*, contributes 10 per cent (7.16 lakh M.T. annually) in the total milk production of India - *highest per capita milk availability of 1 kilogram in the State as dairying sector grows at rate of 4.14 per cent*, high productivity of inland fish production (6,094 kg per ha vi-a-vis national average of 2,600 kg per ha), better human development index – *India State Hunger Index 2008 indicates lowest level of hunger for the State*, good basic infrastructure – ranks top among States in surveys by different agencies (CMIE and NCAER), per capita generation of power highest among States and 2.5 times the national average – *all the villages have been electrified and connected to the State electrical power grid since 1974*, telephone/communication infrastructure and facilities in all cities, small towns and villages – *large number of villages have facility of direct dial for international calls*, and good banking infrastructure with 2,478 branches of scheduled commercial banks and 635 branches of the State Cooperative banks. The main weaknesses include, declining growth of the primary sector – from 4.6 per cent in 1980s to 2.5 per cent in 1990s and then to 2 per cent in early 2000s, anticipated to be caused due to technology fatigue and over exploitation of the natural resources viz. soil and water; an yield gap of 10 to 15 per cent in some parts of the State due to low seed replacement ratio, lack of seed treatment, gaps in supply of other inputs, soil erosion, and water logging; declining water tables and problem of salinity in areas with poor quality of underground water with in-sufficient canal water; flow of underground water from *North-East to South-West* coupled with seepage of water from two major canals (Rajasthan Canal and Sirhind Feeder) creates problem of water logging in some cotton belt pockets; difficulty in installing tubewell in zones I and II due to sand and boulder substrata along with high energy requirement for pumping deep underground water there, adds to the woes of loosing rain water as run off due to steady slopes and scanty afforestation in these areas; sizable number of low yielding livestock animals; poor artificial insemination services contribute to infertility in exotic animals; problem of low availability of green fodder that accentuates during summer and autumn months; despite high milk production/potential, lack of bulk chillers in the interiors shortens the shelf life of milk due to high bacterial count at the initial stage, necessitating addition of high doses of unwanted preservatives; and the non-availability of fish seeds hinders fishery development. The main opportunities include, scope of yield-improvement in the identified villages/blocks - constraints are determined and strategies are ready to

overcome them; promotion of cultivation of vegetables, flowers and ornamental plants conditional open development of processing industry and proper marketing infrastructure; the rising income of urban-dwellers (constituting about one-third of the State's population) is enhancing the demand for milk, and meat, apart from their high export potential; installation of bulk chillers in the interiors has potential of improving marketability of milk by improving its shelf-life - potential for high growth in dairying sector; scope for enhanced production in the poultry sector by overcoming problems of breed, feed and medicines; fishery sector can be expanded by transforming the large number of existing village ponds for fisheries operations from their present use as sewage ponds; further, enhancing availability of fish seed shall contribute to fisheries development; and filling large number of vacant positions of extension personnel (50 per cent) shall be useful in agricultural development. The threats include, depletion of groundwater resources due to excessive use in large part (117 development blocks out of total 143), deterioration in soil health both physically and by fertility, nutrient deficiency and elemental toxicity in specific pockets, soil nutrient imbalance, accumulation of salts and increasing sodicity due to use of poor quality (ground) water, lack of drainage in some pockets causing water logging, soil-erosion in zone I, and high infestation of pests due to intensive cultivation.

5. Whether Convergence- inter and intra department/programmes- been attempted and what is the extent of convergence? Have all potential options for convergence been identified and explored?

The SAP is not much explicit in its attempt for *convergence*- inter and intra department/programmes. Further, the SAP does not provide idea about the extent of *convergence*. The SAP does not give information about whether all potential options for convergence have been identified and explored.

However, the SAP states its intention of achieving the desired 4 per cent growth rate in agriculture & allied sectors by implementing the already existing centrally sponsored schemes and newly proposed interventions or projects as planned under RKVY. It gives sector-wise budget amount approved under the XIth Plan (2007-08 to 2011-12) as well as proposed allocations under the *State Agriculture Plan* (arrived at through the village survey following farmers' participatory approach, for period 2009-10 to 2013-14). The SAP indicates its intention to use the approved budget allocation for the XIth Plan (2007-08 to 2011-12) towards fulfilling proposed strategy requirements under the SAP (2009-10 to 2013-14). It gives, by sectors, the difference between budgetary requirement (under SAP, 2009-10 to 2013-14) and approved outlay (under the XIth Plan, 2007-08 to 2011-12) for year 2010-11 as the *additional budget requirement* for that year. The total proposed budgetary requirement, approved outlay and additional budget requirement for the whole agriculture & allied sector for year 2010-11 are Rs 1054.98 crores, Rs 202.83 crores and Rs 852.15 crores, respectively. The SAP enumerates CSS schemes/projects from various sectors under the XIth Plan along with their pattern of funding/sharing of funds as *Centrally sponsored* and *State sponsored* and the outlay for each scheme/project. But, convergence of *Centrally sponsored* and *State sponsored* contributions towards funding each mentioned scheme/project is not explicit in the SAP.

6. Has the experience of on-going CSS and state schemes been studied and lessons learnt have been incorporated in SAP/C-DAPs for replication/ expansion/ modification in uncovered areas?

It is not explicit in the SAP whether the experience of on-going CSS and state schemes has been studied and the lessons learnt have been incorporated in SAP/C-DAPs for replication/ expansion/ modification in uncovered areas. However, the SAP does enumerate various ongoing schemes under the XIth Plan (2007-08 to 2011-12).

7. Whether the yield gaps and returns in different crops/livestock/fisheries have been estimated?

The SAP refers to estimated yield gaps and returns for different crops/livestock/fisheries. A look at the C-DAPs confirms it. C-DAPs provide analysis of yield gaps by comparing the average *potential yield/Frontline Demonstration* (determined by demonstrations on improved package of practices for various crops conducted during last few years) with the average yield at blocks/district/State level. For example, in district S.A.S. Nagar, the average *Frontline Demonstration* (FLD) yield for Rice is 60 quintals per hectare (q/ha), whereas average yield for the three blocks (*Kharar, Majri and Derabassi*), the district and the State are 40 q/ha, 50 q/ha, 45 q/ha, 45 q/ha and 33 q/ha, respectively. The C-DAPs provide percentage yield with respect to FLD for various crops like rice, maize, pulses, wheat and sunflower.

8. How the technological and agronomic gaps were identified to contribute to yield gaps?

The SAP states that the technological and agronomic gaps/ constraints are identified using primary (through participatory rural appraisal) and secondary data at village/block/district levels. The primary data collected from *gram panchayat* were tabulated and compiled at block level of each district, followed by cross-checking/verification, and then preparation of block agricultural plans. The block agricultural plans were used to compile the C-DAPs. Technological and agronomic gaps/ constraints given in the SAP are identified from the primary and secondary data provided in the various C-DAPs.

9. How the identified constraints are adjudged responsible for low crop productivity in general and specific crops in particular? Is it an opinion or stated on the empirical basis?

Though not explicit, it is implicit that the primary data collected through participatory rural appraisal at the village level and the secondary data are instrumental in adjudging the identified constraints responsible for low crop productivity. However, the SAP misses to give systematic crop-wise constraints. But the C-DAPs do enumerate constraints responsible for low crop productivity of specific crops.

10. How the interventions are identified to bridge the gaps in productivity levels?

The SAP provides strategies/interventions under the Plan along with broad proposed allocations for various agriculture & allied sectors. We may anticipate the role of primary data collected through participatory rural appraisal, secondary data and use of information provided in various C-DAPs in identification of the interventions. However, the methodology for identification of the interventions is not explicit in the SAP.

11. Whether the right strategies have been prioritized to bridge the yield gaps in crop/livestock/fisheries and maximize returns to farmers have been clearly spelt out? Whether the empirical basis for appropriate strategies provided? How far they have been obtained/decided through a consultative process with all the relevant stake holders?

Though the SAP provides strategies/interventions under the Plan for various agriculture & allied sectors, yet their systematic prioritization is not explicit in the SAP. We do not have evidence in

the SAP of involving empirical basis for the appropriate strategies. Though it is not explicit in the SAP how far the strategies have been obtained/ decided through a consultative process with all the relevant stake holders, yet the SAP states of involving participatory rural appraisal technique covering farmers from all sections, while collecting primary data for the preparation of C-DAPs. The SAP states the role of primary and secondary data and clientele demand in preparation of the SAP and formulating the strategies.

12. Whether the prioritized strategies have been translated into programmes/projects/activities by sectors and years with clear cut objectives, targets, output, outcome, funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project? Whether the viability of each project to achieve the expected output considered?

The SAP attempts to translate the given strategies into activities with proposed funding (by sectors and years) **only** at the district/block level. However, it does not provide objectives, targets, output and outcome for each activity at the district/block level. It also misses to translate the given strategies into programmes/projects/activities by sectors and years at the State/zone level. It is not explicit whether viability of projects to achieve the expected output is considered.

13. Have border areas/ insurgent areas/problem areas (mining, acidic soils etc) have been addressed by formulating any specific projects?

The SAP does not enumerate projects (planned for period 2009-10 to 2013-14) at the State level, though some are given at the district/block level in Volume-II of the SAP. However, various districts have proposed projects addressing problems of saline/poor fertile soils by formulating specific projects. For example, Fardikot district lying in *Western Plain Zone* faces problem of soil fertility and salt accumulation with use of poor quality water. To overcome these problems, the district proposes activities/projects of distribution of agricultural inputs (at fifty per cent subsidy) like vermin compost, green manure seeds, micro-nutrients, gypsum, bio pesticides, along with establishing vermi compost units.

14. What is the mismatch (difference between estimated budget in SAP/C-DAP and the approved and used budget) between the projections and funding in SAPs/C-DAPs and the projects (difference between planned projects in SAP/C-DAP and approved projects and funding being implemented)? How this mismatch affects the targets, expected outputs/outcomes/growth impact?

The SAP proposes outlays of Rs 1370.88 crores, 1054.98 crores, 979.98 crores, 982.01 crores and 982.94 crores for years 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14, respectively. The total proposed allocation for the five-year plan period amounts to Rs 5370.80 crores (2009-10 to 2013-14). However, the State had also made separate provision under RKVY for the XIth Plan (2007-08 to 2011-12). According to the SAP, the XIth Plan has a total approved outlay of Rs 1165.76 crores under various agriculture & allied sectors, which also includes provision of Rs 485.00 crores for RKVY, for the five-year period.

For the XIth Plan (2007-08 to 2011-12), the SAP provides information on approved outlays only and not on proposed funds. Therefore we cannot comment on the mismatch between proposed and approved funds considering XIth Plan (2007-08 to 2011-12) information only. According to the *Statement of Release and Unspent Balance* (dated 15/11/2009) provided by the State government, the State government received from Central government Rs 34.15 crores, Rs 87.52 crores and Rs 27.02 crores for years 2007-08, 2008-09 and 2009-10, respectively, under RKVY.

However, the SAP considers overall agricultural assistance received from the Central government (including under RKVY) for fulfilling the Plan requirements stated in the SAP (2009-10 to 2013-14). Accordingly, it itself calculates the mismatch between proposed allocations (SAP, 2009-10 to 2013-14) and approved outlay (under the XIth Plan, 2007-08 to 2011-12) for year 2010-11 as the *additional budget requirement* for that year. The total proposed budgetary requirement, approved outlay and additional budget requirement for the whole agriculture & allied sector for year 2010-11 are Rs 1054.98 crores, Rs 202.83 crores and Rs 852.15 crores, respectively. The mismatch of Rs 852.15 crores which is 80.8 per cent of the proposed budgetary requirement of the year is huge enough to disrupt the implementation of the planned strategies in the SAP. For year 2009-10, the approved outlay (under the XIth Plan, 2007-08 to 2011-12) is 253.07 crores vis-à-vis proposed outlay (SAP, 2009-10 to 2013-14) of Rs 1370.88 crores. The mismatch comes out to be 1117.5 crores which is 81.5 per cent of the proposed funds. Mismatch is significant to impact the proposed Plan.

15. Are the projects/programmes large enough, instead of being small and prolific pilot type schemes, to make a visible (impact) in the sectors?

The SAP does not provide project-wise proposed budget outlays at State level, though it provides the same at district/block level by activities. Therefore, we cannot comment on the size of the projects. However, the SAP enumerates various strategies that involve large funds. For example, strategies planned under major strategy heads *improving water use efficiency*, *seed related strategies* and *institutional/infrastructure development* have been proposed Rs 918.47 crores, Rs 480.68 crores and Rs 845.46 crores, respectively.

16. Has the SAPs identified Flagship programmes (extensive to cover large part of the state and larger area)?

The SAP does not mention the Flagship programmes. However, it proposes major strategies with huge budget outlays. For example, strategies planned under major strategy heads *improving water use efficiency*, *seed related strategies* and *institutional/infrastructure development* have been proposed Rs 918.47 crores, Rs 480.68 crores and Rs 845.46 crores, respectively.

17. Whether sectoral and spatial allocation of funds conforms to equitable and optimal distribution of resources?

The SAP proposes to allocate 50.2 per cent, 23.4 per cent, 15.8 per cent, 4 per cent, 3 per cent and 2 per cent of the total proposed budget under SAP (2009-10 to 2013-14) to *Agriculture*, *Animal husbandry*, *soil & water conservation*, *dairy development & milk fed*, *horticulture and hisheries* sectors, respectively. The sectoral allocation of funds broadly conforms to equitable and optimal distribution of resources. According to the SAP, the crop sector contributes two-third and the livestock sector contributes one-third to the whole primary sector. Hence, highest shares of 50.2 per cent and 23.4 per cent for the *Agriculture* and *Animal husbandry* sectors, respectively are justified. Degradation of soil/soil salinity and declining water tables in major part of the State are the serious threats faced by the State. Therefore, a share of 15.8 per cent to that end is desirable.

The spatial allocation of funds may also be considered as conforming to the equitable and optimal distribution of resources, since the coefficient of correlation between district-wise proposed budget and respective district population, involving all the districts, is moderately high at +0.45. Some districts have not been allocated funds according to their population share. For

example, Amritsar (population share: 11.7 per cent, allocation share: 6.1 per cent), Gurdaspur (population share: 7.9 per cent, allocation share: 4.0 per cent), Patiala (population share: 7.0 per cent, allocation share: 4.2 per cent), Sangrur (population share: 7.5 per cent, allocation share: 2.5 per cent), Fatehgarh Sahib (population share: 2.0 per cent, allocation share: 6.2 per cent), Hoshiarpur (population share: 5.6 per cent, allocation share: 15.02 per cent), Moga (population share: 3.4 per cent, allocation share: 5.9 per cent) and Nawanshehar (population share: 2.2 per cent, allocation share: 4.3 per cent).

18. Are there any innovative projects? If so, how do they contribute to fulfill the special needs outside ongoing programs?

The SAP does not mention the innovative projects. However, many of the proposed strategies may be considered to be innovative. For example, *well furnished training centres at block and district level with modern AV aids, strengthening of labs, setting up poly clinic, strengthening of Farmers' Information Advisory Centres with high speed net connectivity, weather forecasting stations, promoting integrated nutrient management, organic farming, encouraging green manuring & bio-fertilizers, providing Gypsum for reclamation of salt affected soils, conserving water resources by laying underground water pipes and promotion of micro irrigation system, encouraging water-saving technologies like laser-levelers* etc. In fact, most of the strategies proposed in the SAP are of innovative nature and involve substantial funding. For example, *improving water use efficiency, seed related strategies and institutional/infrastructure development* have been proposed Rs 918.47 crores, Rs 480.68 crores and Rs 845.46 crores, respectively.

19. What is the basis of planning certain projects for the State as a whole and how do they get monitored?

The SAP is not explicit on the basis of planning projects for the State as a whole and how they get monitored. In fact, the SAP misses to mention the projects at the State level. However, it attempts to give activities at the district/block level. But the SAP has a budget-head by name "State level Institutional Strengthening" involving total proposed allocation of Rs 62.25 crores distributed over the five year Plan period (2009-10 to 2013-14).

20. What is the basis of sectoral fund allocation? Is it based on expected marginal contributions? Any viability analysis is made?

The SAP does not make explicit the basis of sectoral fund allocation. However, it refers to the contribution of the agricultural & allied sectors by stating that the crop sector contributes two-third and the livestock sector contributes one-third to the whole primary sector. The contribution share of the agricultural & allied sectors and the SWOT analysis of agriculture in the State may be the implicit basis of sectoral fund allocation in the SAP. It is not clear from the SAP whether sectoral fund allocation is based on expected marginal contributions. There is no mention of the viability analysis.

21. Whether the allocations across years were right? What was the basis for yearly allocations?

The SAP proposes outlays of Rs 1370.88 crores (25.5 per cent), 1054.98 crores (19.6 per cent), 979.98 crores (18.2 per cent), 982.01 crores (18.3 per cent) and 982.94 crores (18.3 per cent) for years 2009-10, 2010-11, 2011-12, 2012-13 and 2013-14 of the Plan, respectively.

The allocations across years do not seem to be correct. Highest allocation is made for the first year when fund requirements and utilization should ideally be low, being project-planning stage. The allocation size then decreases in the subsequent years whereas it should ideally rise to the maximum-level during second year and third years owing to higher investment needs for project implementation. The basis for yearly allocations is not clear in the SAP.

22. Is the SAP in line/ tune with overall agricultural strategy and goals of the country/ state?

Yes, the SAP seems to be in line/ tune with overall agricultural strategy and goals of the country/ state. The SAP makes budget proposals for the strategies formulated by it keeping in mind the goals. It has ambitious Plan of raising the agriculture & allied sectors growth to above 4 per cent. It is in line with the country's goal of attaining 4 per cent growth rate during the XIth five-year Plan.

23. Whether mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress are clearly spelt out?

The mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress are not spelt out in the SAP. However, the methodology section of the SAP that describes systematic preparation of the C-DAPs does give indication about the presence of mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress in the State.

Directions for 12th FYP

1. Whether the planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms exist, functional and made use of to fulfill the expectation and bridge the gaps? If not, what is the plan for strengthening PME mechanisms and making them functional during the remaining years of 11th FYP and 12th FYP when it gets launched? Whether the baseline information is maintained for comparison of performance of the project later?

The methodology section of the SAP that describes systematic preparation of the C-DAPs, gives indication about the presence of mechanisms for planning, baseline information collection, monitoring, documentation and regularly reporting progress in the State. Otherwise, the SAP is not explicit on the existence, functioning and use of planning, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms, to fulfill the expectation and bridge the gaps. However, the SAP involves a budget outlay of Rs 62.25 crores towards *State Level Institutional strengthening* that includes a provision of Rs 2.40 crores towards *Planning, Monitoring, Concurrent-Evaluation & Evaluation Centre*.

The SAP is not explicit on the plan for strengthening PME mechanisms and making them functional during the remaining years of 11th FYP and 12th FYP when it gets launched. Again, it is not explicit whether the baseline information is maintained for comparison of performance of the project later.

2. Whether the mid-term evaluation by the external agency is done for change of the targets and inter-sectoral resource adjustments?

It is not mentioned.

3. Is social audit done to facilitate publicity on status of the implementation and maintenance of transparency?

It is not mentioned.

4. What are the major lessons from RKVY implementation in the State for the 12th FYP?

(i) The SAP should mention projects under RKVY at the State level, giving clear-cut objectives, targets, output, outcome and funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project, along with the given details of existing C.S.S. schemes, for the five-year plan period (2007-08 to 2009-10). It will be useful in analyzing the extent of convergence of existing schemes with the RKVY. The logic of preparing SAP for 2009-14 is not clear. In fact no other State has followed this approach. By doing so, the RKVY projects getting implemented during 2007-09, cannot find continuity and consolidation.

(ii) The main experiences of implementing CSS/State schemes should be summarized and whether/how they are made use of to prepare SAP for replication, expansion etc should be stated.

(iii) Prioritization of interventions needs to be attempted using standard objective methods.

(iv) The project proposals should emanate from Districts preferably Zilla Parishads on the basis of C-DAPs.

(v) There should be rigorous filtering of project proposals by an expert Committee earlier and in SLSC meetings later.

(vi) There should be a dedicated PM&E mechanism at the State level for facilitating project screening, database management, monitoring, evaluation and reporting of RKVY projects. It should facilitate mid-term evaluation by external agency and also social audit to facilitate publicity and maintenance of transparency.

(vii) The SAP should mention in more detail the State-level target for agriculture & allied sectors / sub-sectors to be achieved using RKVY funding during the five-year Plan period, vis-à-vis should give the base-year values.

(viii) The SAP should provide more systematic yield-gap estimates, both at State and district-level, for major crops and other enterprises.

Overall conclusion

The SAP is attempted well. It makes two types of plans, one for 2007-08 to 2011-12 and another for 2009-10 to 2013-14. No other State has attempted this way. It describes the methodology for the preparation of the C-DAPs; informs about State's geography, climate, economy, infrastructure, agriculture along with strengths and major problems; describes issues, vision and growth drivers at State/zone level by sectors; proposes a number of strategies for solving identified problems by sectors along with budget outlay for each major strategy head; gives year-wise and sector-wise proposed budget allocations for the State and all districts – with details of approved outlay; and touches on expected output/targets/yield-gaps at the district-level for all districts. In addition, it involves a separate volume giving district/block level proposed activities along with budget outlays for each activity. However, the SAP misses to mention projects under RKVY (2007-08 to 2008-09 / 2009-10 to 2013-14) at the State level. It should give project-details with clear-cut objectives, targets, output, outcome and funding (RKVY, other sources) for each project. It should give more detail on the convergence of schemes; mention if it has incorporated into the SAP the lessons learnt by studying experience of other ongoing schemes; and plan the PM&E mechanisms including baseline information collection, documentation and regularly reporting progress. The 12th FYP exercise has to focus on these points.